

# U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE SPECIES ASSESSMENT AND LISTING PRIORITY ASSIGNMENT FORM

**Scientific Name:**

Exocarpos menziesii

**Common Name:**

Menzies ballart

**Lead region:**

Region 1 (Pacific Region)

**Information current as of:**

06/23/2014

**Status/Action**

☐ Funding provided for a proposed rule. Assessment not updated.

☐ Species Assessment - determined species did not meet the definition of the endangered or threatened under the Act and, therefore, was not elevated to the Candidate status.

☒ New Candidate

☐ Continuing Candidate

☐ Candidate Removal

☐ Taxon is more abundant or widespread than previously believed or not subject to the degree of threats sufficient to warrant issuance of a proposed listing or continuance of candidate status

☐ Taxon not subject to the degree of threats sufficient to warrant issuance of a proposed listing or continuance of candidate status due, in part or totally, to conservation efforts that remove or reduce the threats to the species

☐ Range is no longer a U.S. territory

☐ Insufficient information exists on biological vulnerability and threats to support listing

☐ Taxon mistakenly included in past notice of review

☐ Taxon does not meet the definition of "species"

☐ Taxon believed to be extinct

☐ Conservation efforts have removed or reduced threats

\_\_\_ More abundant than believed, diminished threats, or threats eliminated.

## **Petition Information**

☒ Non-Petitioned

\_\_\_ Petitioned

90-Day Positive:

12 Month Positive:

Did the Petition request a reclassification?

### **For Petitioned Candidate species:**

Is the listing warranted(if yes, see summary threats below)

To Date, has publication of the proposal to list been precluded by other higher priority listing?

Explanation of why precluded:

## **Historical States/Territories/Countries of Occurrence:**

- **States/US Territories:** Hawaii
- **US Counties:** Hawaii, HI, Maui, HI
- **Countries:** United States

## **Current States/Counties/Territories/Countries of Occurrence:**

- **States/US Territories:** Hawaii
- **US Counties:** Hawaii, HI
- **Countries:** United States

## **Land Ownership:**

This species occurs on privately owned land.

## **Lead Region Contact:**

ARD-ECOL SVCS, Jesse D'Elia, 5032312349, jesse\_delia@fws.gov

## **Lead Field Office Contact:**

PACIFIC ISLANDS FISH AND WILDL OFC, Kristi Young, 808-792-9419, kristi\_young@fws.gov

## **Biological Information**

### **Species Description:**

*Exocarpos menziesii* is shrub that reaches up to 2 meters (m) in height; stems are densely branched, especially toward the ends, with conspicuously maroon-tinged tips. The leaves are usually scale-like, occasionally a few foliaceous leaves present. The foliaceous leaves are elliptic to oblanceolate, 10-14 millimeters (mm) long, 3-6 mm wide, with cuneate to attenuate base and sessile. Flowers are perfect, 5 red petals approximately 3 mm long. Drupes are reddish brown to red at maturity, ellipsoid to narrowly ovoid, and 7-10 mm long with the exposed portion above the receptacle 3-6 mm long; the apex is rounded with a small terminal beak or 3 inconspicuous indentations, partially embedded in a yellow, fleshy receptacle (Wagner *et al.* 1999, p. 1218).

### **Taxonomy:**

*Exocarpos menziesii* was recognized as a distinct taxon in the 1999 update to the Manual of Flowering Plants of Hawaii (Wagner *et al.* 1999, p. 1218).

### **Habitat/Life History:**

*Exocarpos menziesii* occurs scattered in ohia shrubland or on lava flows with sparse vegetation between 1,400 to 2,100 m in elevation (Wagner *et al.* 1999, p. 1218). It occurs in in drier forest areas (Wagner *et al.* 1999, p. 1218).

### **Historical Range/Distribution:**

*Exocarpos menziesii* is historically known from the islands of Lanai (Kaiholena Gulch) and Hawaii (from Kahuku Ranch in the south up through Hualalai and Puukapele on the leeward slopes) (Wagner *et al.* 1999, p. 1218).

### **Current Range Distribution:**

Currently, there is one scattered occurrence of *Exocarpos menziesii* on the slopes of Hualalai, on the southern leeward side of Hawaii Island (Thomas 2012, in litt.; PEPP 2013, pp. 10, 33). There are no known occurrences of the species on Lanai.

### **Population Estimates/Status:**

Currently, *Exocarpos menziesii* is limited to fewer than 50 individuals on Hawaii Island (PEPP 2013, pp. 10, 33) (see Current Range Distribution, above).

## **Threats**

### **A. The present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range:**

We acknowledge that the specific natures of the threats to individual native Hawaiian plant species are not completely understood. Scientific research on native Hawaiian plant species is limited because of their rarity and the challenging logistics associated with conducting field work in Hawaii (e.g., areas are typically remote, difficult to access and work in, and expensive to survey in a comprehensive manner). However, there is information available on many of the threats that act on Hawaiian ecosystems, and, for some ecosystems, these threats are well studied and understood. Each of these native species is exposed to those threats to varying degrees. For the purposes of our candidacy determination, our assumption is that the threats that act at the ecosystem level also act on each of the species that occur in those ecosystems. Some native Hawaiian species, including the plant *Exocarpos menziesii*, are components of the native ecosystems that have shown

declines in number of individuals, number of occurrences, or changes in species abundance and species composition that can be reasonably attributed to the threats discussed below.

The Hawaiian Islands are located over 2,000 mi (3,200 km) from the nearest continent. This isolation has allowed the few plants and animals that arrived in the Hawaiian Islands to evolve into many highly varied and endemic species (species that occur nowhere else in the world). The only native terrestrial mammals in the Hawaiian Islands are two bat taxa, the extant Hawaiian hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*) and an extinct, unnamed insectivorous bat (Ziegler 2002, p. 245). The native plants of the Hawaiian Islands, therefore, evolved in the absence of mammalian predators, browsers, or grazers. As a result, many of the native species have lost unneeded defenses against threats such as mammalian predation and competition with aggressive, weedy plant species that are typical of continental environments (Loope 1992, p. 11; Gagne and Cuddihy 1999, p. 45; Wagner et al. 1999d, pp. 36). For example, Carlquist (in Carlquist and Cole 1974, p. 29) notes that Hawaiian plants are notably free from many characteristics thought to be deterrents to herbivores (toxins, oils, resins, stinging hairs, coarse texture). Native Hawaiian plants are therefore highly vulnerable to the impacts of introduced mammals and alien plants. In addition, species restricted and adapted to highly specialized locations (e.g., *Exocarpos menziesii*) are particularly vulnerable to changes (e.g., nonnative species, hurricanes, fire, and climate change) in their habitat (Carlquist and Cole 1974, pp. 2829; Loope 1992, pp. 36; Stone 1992, pp. 88102).

The following constitutes a list of ecosystem-scale threats that may affect *Exocarpos menziesii* in the dry ecosystems on Lanai and Hawaii Island):

- 1) Foraging and trampling of native plants by goats (*Capra hircus*), pigs (*Sus scrofa*), axis deer (*Axis axis*), and mouflon sheep (*Ovis gmelini musimon*) results in severe erosion of watersheds because these mammals inhabit terrain that is often steep and remote (Cuddihy and Stone 1990, p. 63). They destabilize soils that support native plant communities, bury or damage native plants, and adversely affect water quality due to runoff over exposed soils. They also destroy the seeds and seedlings of native plant species (Cuddihy and Stone 1990, p. 63), which facilitates the conversion of disturbed areas from native to nonnative vegetative communities.
- 2) Disturbance of soils by feral pigs creates fertile seedbeds for nonnative species (Cuddihy and Stone 1990, p. 65).
- 3) Nutrient availability increases as a result of pigs rooting in the nitrogen-poor soils, thus facilitating the establishment of nonnative invasive weeds. Invasive weeds are more adapted to nutrient rich soils than native plants (Cuddihy and Stone 1990, p. 63), and rooting activity creates open areas in forests allowing alien species to completely replace native stands.
- 4) Rodents damage plant propagules, seedlings, or native trees, which changes forest composition and structure (Cuddihy and Stone 1990, p. 67).
- 5) Nonnative insects feed on and defoliate native plants, which reduces the geographic range of some species (Cuddihy and Stone 1990, p. 71). Nonnative insects also predate native insect pollinators, which can affect the reproductive success of native plant species (Cuddihy and Stone 1990, p. 71).
- 6) Large numbers of nonnative invertebrates such as earthworms, ants, slugs, isopods, millipedes, and snails can cause significant changes in nutrient cycling processes resulting in changes to the composition and structure of plant communities (Cuddihy and Stone 1990, p. 73).
- 7) Nonnative plants displace native Hawaiian species by competing for water, nutrients, light and space; or they may produce a chemical that inhibits growth of other plants (Smith 1985, pp. 180250; Vitousek et al. 1987 in Cuddihy and Stone 1990, p. 74).

Climate change may pose a threat to the ecosystem that supports this species. Fortini *et al.* (2013, pp. 1134) conducted a landscape-based assessment of climate change vulnerability for native plants of Hawaii using high resolution climate change projections. Climate change vulnerability is defined as the relative inability of a species to display the possible responses necessary for persistence under climate change. The assessment by Fortini *et al.* (2013, p. 76) concluded that *Exocarpos menziesii* is **vulnerable** to the impacts of climate change. Therefore, additional management actions may be needed to conserve this taxon into the future.

## **B. Overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes:**

None known at this time.

## **C. Disease or predation:**

None known at this time.

## **D. The inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms:**

The capacity of Federal and State agencies and their nongovernmental partners in Hawaii to mitigate the effects of introduced pests, such as ungulates, rodents, and weeds, is limited due to the large number of taxa currently causing damage (Coordinating Group on Alien Pest Species (CGAPS) 2009). Invasive weeds are a concern in the Hawaiian Islands because their ranges, though currently small, are expanding. Although additional funding has recently been approved by the State legislature for the Hawaii Invasive Species Committee (HB1716), resources available to reduce the spread of these species and counter their negative ecological effects are still quite limited. Control of established pests is largely focused on a few invasive species that cause significant economic or environmental damage to public and private lands. Comprehensive control of an array of invasive pests and management to reduce disturbance regimes that favor certain invasive species remains limited in scope. If current levels of funding and regulatory support for invasive species control are maintained on Lanai and Hawaii Island, the Service expects existing programs to continue to exclude or, on a very limited basis, control invasive species only in high-priority areas. Threats from established pests (e.g., nonnative ungulates, weeds, and invertebrates) are ongoing and expected to continue into the future.

Currently, four agencies are responsible for inspection of goods arriving in Hawaii: Hawaii Department of Agriculture (HDOA), U.S. Department of Homeland Security-Customs and Border Protection (CBP), U.S. Department of Agriculture-Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service-Plant Protection and Quarantine (USDA-APHIS-PPQ), and the Service (CGAPS 2009). The HODA inspects domestic cargo and vessels, and focuses on pests of concern to Hawaii, especially insects or plant diseases not yet known to be present in the State (HDOA 2009). The CBP is responsible for inspecting commercial, private, and military vessels and aircraft, and related cargo and passengers arriving from foreign locations. The CBP focuses on a wide range of quarantine issues involving non-propagative plant materials (processed and unprocessed); wooden packing materials, timber, and products; internationally regulated commercial species under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES); seeds and plants listed as noxious; soil; and pests of concern to the greater United States, such as pests of mainland U.S. forests and agriculture. The USDA-APHIS-PPQ inspects propagative plant material, provides identification services for arriving plants and pests, conducts pest risk assessments, trains CBP personnel, conducts permitting and preclearance inspections for products originating in foreign countries, and maintains a pest database. The Service inspects arriving wildlife products, with the goal of enforcing the injurious wildlife provisions of the Lacey Act (18 U.S.C. 42; 16 U.S.C. 3371 *et seq.*), and CITES.

The State of Hawaii's unique biosecurity needs are not recognized by Federal import regulations. Under the USDA-APHIS-PPQs commodity risk assessments for plant pests, regulations are based on species considered threats to the mainland United States and do not address many species that could be pests in Hawaii (Hawaii Legislative Reference Bureau (HLRB) 2002, pp. 1109; USDA-APHIS-PPQ 2010, pp. 188; CGAPS 2009, pp. 114). Interstate commerce provides the pathway for invasive species and commodities infested with non-Federal quarantine pests to enter Hawaii. Pests of quarantine concern for Hawaii may be intercepted at Hawaiian ports by Federal agents, but are not always acted on by them because these pests are not regulated under Federal mandates. Hence, Federal protection against pest species of concern to Hawaii has historically been inadequate. It is possible for the USDA to grant Hawaii protective exemptions under the Special Local Needs Rule, when clear and comprehensive arguments for both agricultural and conservation issues are provided; however, this exemption procedure operates on a case-by-case basis. Therefore, that avenue may

only provide minimal protection against the large diversity of foreign pests that threaten Hawaii. Adequate staffing, facilities, and equipment for Federal and State pest inspectors and identifiers in Hawaii devoted to invasive species interdiction are critical biosecurity gaps (HLRB 2002, pp. 114; USDA-APHIS-PPQ 2010, pp. 188; CGAPS 2009, pp. 114). State laws have recently been passed that allow the HDOA to collect fees for quarantine inspection of freight entering Hawaii (e.g., Act 36 (2011) H.R.S. 150A5.3). Hawaii Act 202(11), passed and enacted on July 8, 2011 (H.B. 1568), now requires commercial harbors and airports in Hawaii to provide biosecurity and inspection facilities to facilitate the movement of cargo through the ports. This enactment is a significant step toward optimizing the biosecurity capacity in the State of Hawaii; however, Act 202(11) is currently in the planning phase and has not yet been implemented. From a Federal perspective, there is a need to ensure that all civilian and military port and airport operations and construction are in compliance with Act 202(11). The introduction of new pests to the State of Hawaii is a significant risk to federally listed species.

On the basis of the above information, existing State and Federal regulatory mechanisms are not adequately preventing the introduction of nonnative species to Hawaii via interstate and international mechanisms, or intrastate movement of nonnative species between islands, and watersheds, and thus do not adequately protect native plants from the threat of new introductions of nonnative species, or from and the continued expansion of nonnative species populations on and between islands and watersheds. Nonnative species may prey upon, modify, or destroy habitat, or directly compete with native species for food, space, and other necessary resources. The impacts from these introduced threats are ongoing and are expected to continue into the future.

The State of Hawaii provides game mammal (feral pigs, goats, cattle, sheep, and mouflon sheep) hunting opportunities on over 100 State-designated public hunting areas, which includes lands in State Forest Reserves and Natural Area Reserves (H.A.R. 13-123; Mello 2011, pers. comm.). The States management objectives for game animals range from maximizing public hunting opportunities (e.g., sustained yield) in some areas to removal by State staff, or their designees, in other areas (H.A.R. 13-123). Often, endemic Hawaiian plants occur in areas where terrestrial habitat may be manipulated for game enhancement and where game populations are maintained at prescribed levels using public hunting (H.A.R. 13-123). Public hunting areas are not fenced, and game mammals have unrestricted access to most areas across the landscape, regardless of underlying land-use designation. While fences are sometimes built to protect areas from game mammals, the current number and locations of fences are not adequate to prevent habitat degradation and destruction for many threatened and endangered species. The State game animal regulations are not designed nor intended to provide habitat protection, and there are no other regulations designed to address habitat protection from ungulates.

## **E. Other natural or manmade factors affecting its continued existence:**

*Exocarpos menziesii* is threatened by having a small number of individuals and populations. Species that are endemic to single islands or small island groups are inherently more vulnerable to extinction than are widespread species because of the increased risk of genetic bottlenecks, random demographic fluctuations, climate change effects, and localized catastrophes such as hurricanes, drought, rockfalls, landslides, and disease outbreaks (Pimm *et al.* 1988, p. 757; Mangel and Tier 1994, p. 607). These problems are further magnified when populations are few and restricted to a very small geographic area, and when the number of individuals in each population is very small. Populations with these characteristics face an increased likelihood of stochastic extinction due to changes in demography, the environment, genetics, or other factors (Gilpin and Soule 1986, pp. 2434). Small, isolated populations often exhibit reduced levels of genetic variability, which diminishes the species capacity to adapt and respond to environmental changes, thereby lessening the probability of long-term persistence (e.g., Barrett and Kohn 1991, p. 4; Newman and Pilson 1997, p. 361). Very small, isolated populations are also more susceptible to reduced reproductive vigor due to ineffective pollination, inbreeding depression, and hybridization. The problems associated with small population size and vulnerability to random demographic fluctuations or natural catastrophes are further magnified by synergistic interactions with other threats (e.g., nonnative plants and animals, drought, or fire).

## Conservation Measures Planned or Implemented :

PEPP is currently monitoring the known population of *Exocarpos menziesii* on Hawaii Island (PEPP 2013, pp. 10, 33).

## Summary of Threats :

Introduced, nonnative animals damage and destroy plants and seeds, modify habitat, create habitat more conducive to alien plant introductions, and spread nonnative plant seeds. Nonnative plants displace and outcompete native species. We therefore consider introduced, nonnative plants and animals to be a serious and ongoing threat to *Exocarpos menziesii*, exacerbated by the continued inadequacy of existing protective regulations. In addition, we consider the threat from limited number of populations and few (less than 100) individuals to be a serious and ongoing threat to the *Exocarpos menziesii* because (1) this species may experience reduced reproductive vigor due to ineffective pollination or inbreeding depression; (2) this species may experience reduced levels of genetic variability, leading to diminished capacity to adapt and respond to environmental changes, thereby lessening the probability of long-term persistence; and (3) a single catastrophic event may result in extirpation of remaining populations and extinction of the species. Climate change may pose a threat to the ecosystems that support these species, thus exacerbating the effects of the aforementioned threats. These threats apply to the entire range of this species.

## For species that are being removed from candidate status:

\_\_\_\_\_ Is the removal based in whole or in part on one or more individual conservation efforts that you determined met the standards in the Policy for Evaluation of Conservation Efforts When Making Listing Decisions(PECE)?

## Recommended Conservation Measures :

Survey for populations of *Exocarpos menziesii* in areas of potentially suitable habitat.

Begin propagation efforts for maintenance of genetic stock.

Reintroduce individuals into suitable habitat within historic range that is being managed for additional known threats (e.g., nonnative animals and plants) to this species

## Priority Table

Magnitude	Immediacy	Taxonomy	Priority
<b>High</b>	<b>Imminent</b>	Monotypic genus	1
		<b>Species</b>	<b>2</b>
		Subspecies/Population	3
	Non-imminent	Monotypic genus	4
		Species	5
		Subspecies/Population	6
Moderate to Low	Imminent	Monotype genus	7
		Species	8
		Subspecies/Population	9
	Non-Imminent	Monotype genus	10
		Species	11
		Subspecies/Population	12

## Rationale for Change in Listing Priority Number:

### Magnitude:

This species is highly threatened by low number of individuals (see Factor E, above).

### Imminence :

The threats to *Exocarpos menziesii* associated with low number of individuals are considered imminent because they are ongoing.

☐ Yes ☐ Have you promptly reviewed all of the information received regarding the species for the purpose of determination whether emergency listing is needed?

### Emergency Listing Review

☐ No ☐ Is Emergency Listing Warranted?

The species does not appear to be appropriate for emergency listing at this time because the immediacy of the threats is not so great as to imperil a significant proportion of the taxon within the time frame of the routine listing process. In addition, individuals of *Exocarpos menziesii* will benefit from conservation actions initiated by the Hawaii Plant Extinction Prevention Program, funded in part by the FWS. These conservation actions may include monitoring, propagation, and outplanting. If it becomes apparent that the routine listing process is not sufficient to prevent large losses that may result in this species' extinction, then the emergency rule process for this species will be initiated. We will continue to monitor the status of *Exocarpos menziesii* as new information becomes available. This review will determine if a change in status is warranted, including the need to make prompt use of emergency listing procedures.

### Description of Monitoring:

Much of the information on this form is based on the data collected by the Hawaii Plant Extinction Prevention Program. In addition, we incorporated additional information on this species from our files and the Manual of Flowering Plants of Hawaii (Wagner et al. 1999, p. 1218).

List all experts contacted in 2014:

Name Date Affiliation

Yoshioko, Joan 04/10/14 Plant Extinction Prevention Program Coordinator

Bakutis, Ane 04/10/14 Plant Extinction Prevention Program, Molokai

Ching, Susan 04/10/14 Plant Extinction Prevention Program, Oahu

McDowell, Wendy 04/10/14 Plant Extinction Prevention Program, Kauai

Oppenheimer, Hank 04/10/14 Plant Extinction Prevention Program, Maui Nui

**Indicate which State(s) (within the range of the species) provided information or comments on the species or latest species assessment:**

none

**Indicate which State(s) did not provide any information or comment:**

none

### **State Coordination:**

The most recent data for this species was received from PEPP on April 10, 2014. PEPP is a multi-agency (including State) program operated by the University of Hawaii that functions to prevent extinction of Hawaii's rarest and most threatened plants.

### **Literature Cited:**

Barrett, S.C.H. and J.R. Kohn. 1991. Genetic and evolutionary consequences of small population size in plants- implications for conservation. In *Genetics and Conservation of Rare Plants*, D.A. Falk and K.E. Holsinger (eds.), Oxford University Press, New York. Pp. 330.

Carlquist, S. and M.J. Cole. 1974. Principles of dispersal and evolution. In *Island Biology*, Columbia University Press, New York. Pp. 2829.

Coordinating Group on Alien Pest Species (CGAPS). 2009. CGAPS vision and action plan. Honolulu. 14 pp.  
Cuddihy, L.W. and C.P. Stone. 1990. Alteration of native Hawaiian vegetation: effects of humans, their activities and introductions. University of Hawaii, Honolulu. 138 pp.

Fortini, L., J. Price, J. Jacobi, A. Vorsino, J. Burgett, K. Brink, F. Amidon, S. Miller, S. O. Gon III, G. Koob, and E. Paxton. 2013. A landscape-based assessment of climate change vulnerability for all native Hawaiian plants. Hawaii Cooperative Studies Unit-University of Hawaii at Hilo, Technical Report HCSU-044. 134 pp.

Gagne, W.C. and L.W. Cuddihy. 1999. Vegetation. In *Manual of the Flowering Plants of Hawaii*, W.L. Wagner, D.R. Herbst, and S.H. Sohmer (eds.), University of Hawaii Press, Bishop Museum Press, Honolulu. Pp. 451-464.

Gilpin, M. and M.E. Soule. 1986. Minimum viable populations. In *Conservation Biology: the Science of Scarcity and Diversity*, M.E. Soule (ed.), Sinauer Associates, Inc., Sunderland. Pp. 242-255.

Hawaii Legislative Reference Bureau (HLRB). 2002. Filling the gaps in the fight against native species. E.K. Ikuma, D. Sugano, and J.K. Marfdin, researchers, Honolulu. 122 pp.

Loope, L.L. 1992. Problems with introduced plant species in national parks and biosphere reserves of the United States. In *Alien Plant Invasions in Native Ecosystems of Hawaii*, C.P. Stone, C.W. Smith, and J.T.

Tunison (eds.), University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu. Pp. 328.

Mangel, M. and C. Tier. 1994. Four facts every conservation biologist should know about persistence. *Ecology* 75: 607614.

Newman, D. and D. Pilson. 1997. Increased probability of extinction due to decreased genetic effective population size: experimental populations of *Clarkia pulchella*. *Evolution* 51: 354362.

Plant Extinction Prevention Program (PEPP). 2013. 2013 Annual Report. 207 pp.

PEPP. 2014, in litt. Notes on PEPP species provided by PEPP director Joan Yoskioko.

Pimm, S., H.L. Jones, and J. Diamond. 1988. On the risk of extinction. *American Naturalist* 132: 757785.

Smith, C.W. 1985. Impact of alien plants on Hawaii's native biota. In *Hawaii's Terrestrial Ecosystems: Preservation and Management*, C.P. Stone and J.M. Scott (eds.), Cooperative National Park Resources Studies Unit, University of Hawaii, Honolulu. Pp. 180250.

State of Hawaii, HAR. 1999. Rules regulating game mammal hunting, title 13, subtitle 5, part 2, chapter 123. *Hawaii Administrative Rules*. 63 pp.

State of Hawaii, HRS. 2011. Hawaii revised statutes 150A-5.3, Plant and non-domestic animal quarantine and microorganism import. 4 pp.

Thomas, M. 2012, in litt. Photograph of *Exocarpos menziesii* taken in 2012 on Hualalai, Hawaii Island. University of Hawaii at Manoa Department of Botanical Sciences.  
<https://www.flickr.com/photos/uhmuseum/7167624878/in/photostream/>

U.S. Department of Agriculture-APHIS-PPQ. 2010. Roadmap to 2015: a strategic plan for plant protection and quarantine. Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Plant Protection and Quarantine.  
[http://www.aphis.usda.gov/about\\_aphis/programs\\_offices/plant\\_protection/index.shtml](http://www.aphis.usda.gov/about_aphis/programs_offices/plant_protection/index.shtml).


Wagner, W.L., D.R. Herbst, and S.H. Sohmer. 1999. *Manual of the flowering plants of Hawaii*. University of Hawaii Press and Bishop Museum Press, Honolulu. Bishop Museum Special Publications 97. 1,918 pp.

Ziegler, A.C. 2002. *Hawaiian natural history, ecology, and evolution*. University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu. 477 pp.

### **Approval/Concurrence:**

Lead Regions must obtain written concurrence from all other Regions within the range of the species before recommending changes, including elevations or removals from candidate status and listing priority changes; the Regional Director must approve all such recommendations. The Director must concur on all resubmitted 12-month petition findings, additions or removal of species from candidate status, and listing priority changes.

Approve:



06/18/2014

Date

Concur:

David Gotting

11/18/2014

Date

Did not concur:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Director's Remarks: